The MILITANT

Semi-Monthly Organ of the Communist League of America (Opposition)

VOL. II. No. 14. NEW YORK, N. Y. SEPTEMBER 15, 1929. PRICE 5 CENTS

The T. U. E. L. Conference at Cleveland

No Illusions on the Gastonia Trial

As the trial in Charlotte, N. C., of the 16 Gastonia textile strikers and leaders gets under way, it develops certain features which, though dissimilar to many that characterized the trial of Sacco and Vanzetti years ago, does not change the primary fact that it is a frame-up of workers because of their activity in the labor movement.

These features, deliberately developed by the prosecution and the judge, are calculated to create an artificial atmosphere of "fairness", by a scrupulous regard for polite formalities, by insignificant "concessions" to the defense attorneys, by banquets to the prosecution and defense counsel, and by a general skilful handling of the case by the judicial harpies of the Southern textile barons. Why? In order to disarm the protest movement of the workers by creating the impression that the defendants are guaranteed a square deal at the hands of the chivalrous gentlemen of the black robe. The greatest danger to the interests of the defendants lies precisely in these illusions.

The role now being assumed by Judge Barnhill in Charlotte has been played before, and more than once. It was played by Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis to perfection in the trial of the 100 I. W. W. in Chicago during the war, and he succeeded very neatly in disarming the radical press generally. The conviction and the savage sentences he meted out which had been prepared behind this screen, came as a rude jolt to those who thought that fair words and false appearances did away with the class struggle and the class function of the capitalist courts.

It is in the light of this and similar experiences that the workers should read the words of Norman Thomas, the new evangelist of the Socialist Party, in the New Leader (August 31, 1929). He writes enthusiastically: "Hats off to Judge Barnhill for his remarkable fairness thus far to the Gastonia defendants. At least North Carolina is to be spared the disgrace of a Webster Thayer."

This is the quintessence of socialist and liberal wisdom, which limits objection to the frame-up system to the crude jobs of the bungling Thayers. In reality, it is the smoother and suaver Barnhills and Landises who are better exponents of the frame-up system precisely because of their superior "technique". Only a blockhead—or a socialist liberal—can fail to see this.

In the Gastonia case, the prosecution is seeking to establish the responsibility of leaders for all acts of violence that occur during a struggle. The attempt to establish this "principle," on the one hand, and the struggle of the labor movement against it, on the other, run like a red thread through the history of American labor trials since the days of the Haymarket martyrs. This is the essential aspect of the Gastonia frame-up as it has been in many other cases. The real attempt there is to fasten upon Beal and other leaders, who were not even present at the tent colony when the fatal shooting occurred, the responsibility for the death regardless of who fired the shots. With such a precedent fixed, every active fighter and leader in the working class movement can become an easy target for any kind of prosecution for events taking place entirely out of his control. With such a precedent a "Wall Street bomb explosion" caused by accident or by provocateurs, can become the basis for a wholesale victimization.

This is the central feature of the Gastonia case which gives it a particular claim upon the whole labor movement, besides the general claim of solidarity which every worker prosecuted in the capitalist courts for his activity in the class struggle has a right to make.

Precisely for this reason, and for many others that we have adduced in previous issues of the Militant, do we repeat the necessity to emphasize the slogan of the "Fight against the Gastonia frame-up!" as the central rallying cry of the fight for the defense. The slogan of the "right to self-defense" of the workers involved, as the main and only slogan in the campaign, appears to be very radical and revolutionary solely upon the surface. In essence, it narrows the fight to a legal tilt between prosecution and defense, confined to the court-room, to establish the "preponderance of evidence" on the weighty question of... who fired the first shot, as though the class struggle would be suspended while this fine point was fairly adjudicated. As though the honest witnesses for the defense are sure to outnumber and outweigh the hired perjurers of the prosecution backed by mill owners' money.

The workers must be on guard. No illusions! Our countless dead and imprisoned have taught us that the real defense of the workers is a militant protest movement.

The organization of this movement on the broadest basis remains our central task. The formation of a united front—in deeds—against the Gastonia frame-up is a duty of the hour.

Those who want a working class victory for Gastonia must and will work for this with all their might.

A Forecast of the Work of the 'New Trade Union Center'

We go to press before the sessions of the Cleveland conference of the T. U. E. L. have opened; it is therefore necessary to deal with the actions and decisions of the conference in detail in the next issue of the Militant. However, there are already a sufficient number of signs that indicate what the character of the conference will be. We mention a few of them here, and each of them, from a different direction, cast the shadow of what will take place in Cleveland.

1. The delegation from the southern textile fields will probably be the only really representative and important group at the conference. Most of the other delegations represent wishes and hopes instead of substance. We were not taken in by the empty fanfare and "delegations" at the fake Federated Farmer-Labor Party convention in 1923; we are not gullible enough to swallow the delegates "representing the masses of the unorganized" in the shape of formless mass meetings, or, as in most cases, of Party fraction meetings in a shop. The conference was extremely ill-prepared, its slogans were wrong, it was organized in a purely administrative manner without worrying about the masses of the workers. This is not the way to organize the unorganized workers, but to confuse them and to lay the basis for their disillusionment.

2. Johnstone's article in the Daily Worker of August 30, 1929 on the tasks of the conference, which is valuable only for its bluntness and not for its proposals. What Foster is cautious enough to equivocate about, or encircle with qualification, Johnstone blurts out. Like the proposed constitution and program of the T. U. E. L., he tips his hat brusquely to the necessity for working in the old unions, but on this basis: that the Left wing is to work in the old unions only for the purpose of splitting off what they can to affiliate these splinters to the new trade union center. This is plain enough, at any rate. Not only does it violate all we learned in the Communist movement about work in the basic mass organizations of the workers, but it precludes any possibility for carrying on such work. This grows plainer every day. The "new line" results in the surrender of the 3 or more millions of workers still in the A. F. of L. to the mercies of Green.

3. The proof of the virtual liquidation of Party and Left wing activity in the A. F. of L. unions is now mountain-high. A dozen trade union conventions in the last few weeks alone could be cited where not a single Left wing delegate was in evidence, and in many cases for the first time. At the Minnesota State Federation of Labor Convention (at Mankato) only O. R. Votaw, member of the Communist League, was a delegate, with no other Left winger present. The New York State Federation of Labor convention had representatives of the Muste group acting as the only opposition, insipid and timid as it was, to the machine. Numerous other instances show the same dark picture or darker. If this situation can possibly grow worse, the "new line" of the T. U. E. L. is sure to contribute its big mite.

4. The Eastern conference of the Marine Workers League. The ultra-mechanical control by the Party of this movement has throttled it until it is almost a wreck. The results of the policy of alienating and driving away all elements not members of the Party—and of a certain Party faction, at that—has narrowed the League down to its present shadow and resulted in a turn-out of 31 delegates, 2 of whom represented no one at all in New Orleans, 2 more represented the same grand total in Galveston, another 2 spoke for nobody in Boston, with the same from Norwalk. New York represented about 100 members, Philadelphia and Baltimore 50 each. The splendid possibilities for the organization of the movement were whistled away by those put in charge of the work. On the newly elected Executive Committee, there are approximately three actual seamen. The real inner "powers" of the Marine Workers League remain Mink, Sparks and Somers, who are the kind of "seamen" that would look for the foc'c'sle in the galley and for the bo'sun on the bridge. Left wing and revolutionary militants like Jim Gildea, John Russell, Hector Macray, Brophy, S. M. Rose, Fred Crowley, Sizemore and King, were either wangled out, driven away, or "disciplined" out of activity. Their misfortune is that they have experience, ability, authority and prestige among the seamen. Four delegates go from this conference to Cleveland to represent American seamen!

5. The Cleveland conference meets under the warning sign of three severe defeats for the Left wing in the New York unions. The loss of the Left wing furriers' strike and the triumph of the Right wing among the cloakmakers, have delivered a dizzying blow to the organized left wing in New York. In addition, last week's election of officers at the Iron and Bronze Workers Union, under the leadership of the Left wing for years, returned a complete Right wing slate, ousting Rosenfeld, Hofbauer, Powers and Karin who ran for re-election, and giving over the executive board of the union completely to the Rights. Philistine philosophers will always find "objective conditions" to explain these alarming facts. We find the cause where it actually lies—in the false, the radically false policy of the Left wing, that is, of the Communist Party leadership.

The Cleveland conference will run quite smoothly, we know. That has been taken care of in the usual way. It will be of service in emphasizing the great necessity of organizing the unorganized millions, demanded by us over a year ago. But few, if any, clear voices will be raised to demand the revival of the correct line that can fructify the excellent objective possibilities into blossoming realities. For our part, we will continue to demand the application of the teachings of Lenin on work in the trade unions, the united front policy, the organization of the unorganized in reality and not in manifestoes and fake conferences, the collaboration with workers following the progressives, the fight for the class struggle in the unions.

—M. S.

Lovestone's Burglaries

It makes a lot of difference whose office is burglarized, it seems. The Lovestoneites whose skill with the jimmy and the dark lantern is well known have turned their attention—and their burglarious talents—to the National office of the Communist Party, and the workers who have waited a long time for the whole truth are informed in horrified accents that the Party boss of yesterday, blessed by Stalin, saluted by Foster, is not only a petty bourgeois politician and an opportunist but is a burglar and all around crook as well. The working class public on last Tuesday was edified by a detailed account of the robbery in the Daily Worker.

This exhibition of criminality is indeed a shocking spectacle which shames and discredits the communist movement, undermines its prestige and makes it the laughing stock of its enemies. Every revolutionary and every conscientious worker must and will condemn the Lovestone gangsters who have demonstrated once again that they stand on the moral level of the underworld. Such elements are alien to the working class. They belong in the category of criminals who live by their wits, their black-jacks and their jimmies.

But if the burglary of the National office, and the second one a few days later of a section headquarters, were a black tragedy, there is at least a comic relief. This is supplied by the outbursts of moral indignation from the Foster-Wicks leadership of the Party. To hear these people cry one would think they had never seen a burglary before, much less taken part in one together with Lovestone. The two robberies of the office of the Opposition last winter were carried out jointly by them with him. It was an "official" job which they took no pains even to conceal or deny. The stolen documents were flamboyantly displayed a few days later in the Daily Worker and the combined forces of Lovestone and Foster, then happily united, proclaimed to the world that their mutual love was the kind that laughs at locksmiths; that if they couldn't answer our arguments they could at least rob our house and make away with the loot. Those who applauded the burglaries of Lovestone while he was the secretary of the Party have no ground to complain when their chickens come home to roost.

In view of this the fulminations against the latest burglary sound a bit hollow. Stalinism brought with it into the International all the methods of which the present Party leaders complain and they themselves have used them against the Opposition. Therefore we would not advise anyone to take their loud protests against the "underworld and police methods" of Lovestone as an indication of a serious intention on their part to swear off and go straight. It is safer to rely on stronger locks and a watchman with a shotgun.

An Apologetic Progressivism

The road to progress in the labor movement lies in the combination of all the opposition forces against the ruling oligarchs and their policies. Only such a combination, which includes the communists and takes the class struggle for its guiding line, can wage a struggle on the broad front that is necessary and do it with sufficient energy and resolution to stir the masses into motion and lead them forward. The first conditions for the formation of such a movement are already beginning to manifest themselves but they have not yet found the proper form.

The new progressive movement is a sign of the working class impulse in this direction which is being held back from its proper development by the leaders who, thanks to the sectarian line of the Communists, have gained a temporary monopoly of the movement. The greater the urgency of forming a militant opposition and the surer the indications of rank and file readiness for it, the more clearly the unfitness of the leadership of Muste and Company is shown.

The labor movement is also an arena of the class struggle in which the ruling officials represent the capitalists. There can be no dynamic force organized against them which does not proceed from this standpoint, but this is just the issue that the progressive leaders try to evade. Pretending to shape a movement in between the two main counter-currents—the right and the left—they inevitably yield to the former and serve them. Thereby they stultify the rebellious aspirations of the workers and arrest their progress on the path of struggle for a class movement. "Neutrality" between the right and left is as impossible as neutrality in the class struggle. The conflict between these forces is in fact a part of the class struggle and no one can stand half-way between them. The "progressives" are bound to be the allies of one or the other. Failing to steer toward an alliance with the left, they are thrown into the arms of the right. The blows which they make believe to deal "impartially" against the reactionaries—who represent the capialist interest—and the Communists—who represent the proletarian interest—become harder against the latter and feebler against the former.

Recent actions and utterances of Muste and other prominent representatives of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action bear this out already. Muste's article in the "New Leader" for August 17th illustrates the point. There he summons the workers to the standard of the C. P. L. A. in the name of Gompers. Apologizing to the Socialist black hundreds of the United Hebrew Trades for the appearance of the progressive movement, and pleading for "toleration" he asks: "Did he (Gompers) ever question the right of an opposition to exist in the A. F. of L.?"

Such an argument is false and misleading. In the first place Gompers was the symbol of capitalist influence in the labor movement for forty years and remains so today. His spirit belongs exclusively to the exploiters of labor and their agents who are the rightful heirs of Gompers. The attempt to invoke it in the name of a progressive movement can only make the reactionaries laugh and fool the workers. In the second place it is equally wrong to represent Gompers as a democrat who tolerated opposition movements. The present expulsion of the A. F. of L. against the left wing was initiated by him. The expulsion of William F. Dunne from the Portland Convention of the A. F. of L. was a way of "questioning the right of an opposition to exist". Can such an item be overlooked, or is it Muste's idea that "democracy" should not be extended to the Communists? Such apologies to reaction cannot be slogans for a progressive movement of the workers.

The bosses of the United Hebrew Trades have repudiated the C. P. L. A. out of gratitude to Green and Woll for their help in wrecking the left wing unions. A more brazen crime against he workers was never perpetrated than this united front of the bosses, the police, the heads of the A. F. of L. and the Socialist leaders of the needle trades against he workers. The denunciation of such a betrayal is the first duty of a progressive leader. For what else can there be a progressive movement except to call treason by its right name and fight it in the open? But Muste passes it over and even condones it as a matter of course, maintaining only that Green and Woll deserve no special "thanks" for doing their "duty" to the needle trades fakers in distress:

> "Let credit by all means be given where credit is due. But why so much ado about help given by the Executive Council to some of its affiliated bodies? What else is the Executive Council for?"

A movement animated by this pusillanimous spirit will never seriously disturb the agents of capitalism who sit in the seats of power in the trade unions. Their thrones will be shaken only by an army of militants raising the standard of the class struggle and fighting in its spirit. The new progressive movement in its present stage of development does not present such a picture because the discontented workers in the ranks have not yet clarified their aims and thrown up a leadership to express them. This is yet to come. To make the issues clear, to broaden and deepen the movement and inspire it with class struggle militancy is the primary task of the communists. This task will not be accomplished by turning away from the promising beginnings represented by the progressive movement and abandoning it to unworthy leadership. Such a policy only strengthens reaction and its auxiliary forces.

The Communists must establish contact with the workers in the ranks and combine with them for a common struggle. Without the Communist leaven the new progressive movement will have no backbone, it will retreat on all basic questions before the onslaught of the entrenched reactionaries and become a shield for them. The movement which Muste and similars seek to stultify is a genuine movement from below. It has strength, it is growing and will continue to grow as the growing horror of capitalist rationalization drives discontent deeper into the ranks of the masses of the workers. Without asking anybody's permission the Communists must become a part of it, influence it from within, push it to the left and help to shape it into an effective fighting force. Ruthless criticism of the Muste leadership is an indispensible part of this work for the future of the movement.

THE MILITANT

Published twice a month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

Address all mail to: P. O. Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.

Publisher address at 332 18th Street, New York, N. Y.

Subscription rate: 1.00 per year. Foreign $1.50

5c per copy Bundle rates, 3c per copy.

Editor
James P. Cannon

Associate Editors:
Martin Abern
Max Shachtman
Maurice Spector

VOL. II. SEPTEMBER 15, 1919 No. 14.

Entered as second-class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

Party Splitters and Gastonia

As we go to press, comrade Martin Payer of St. Louis informs us that the delegates from the St. Louis Communist League were refused admission to the Gastonia Conference organized there by the party, on the ground that they were "not an organization"! The delegates from the Workers' Alliance then walked out. There were left in this broad united front eight Party members and one delegate from the A. C. W. No attempt was made to organize the sentiment of St. Louis' labor movement for Gastonia. The conference was run by D. E. Earley, travelling job-artist of the Party.

* * *

A mass meeting of the Leninbund (Left Communists) in Berlin, after hearing a report on Gastonia, adopted a resolution of support for the defense, and called for a broad agitation against the proposed lynching of the strikers. An attempt by Stalinist Party thugs to disperse the meeting was repulsed by the workers in attendance.

Another Rumor Nailed

The Stalinist press in Canada is deliberately spreading the lie that one M. Bergstein, Canadian vice-president of the cap and millinery workers' union, and an agent of Zaritsky's right wing crew, is a "Trotskyist" and a member of the Communist League of America (Opposition). This lie is cut out of the whole cloth by Messrs. Buck, MacDonald and Smith. Bergstein was a member of the Canadian Communist Party for years. He was and is a consistent Right winger and an anti-Communist, and when charges were presented against him in the Canadian Political Committee for his collaboration with Zaritsky, Buck and MacDonald covered him up. Now Bergstein is out of the Party and the Stalinists are trying to conceal their own protection of him in the past by telling the lie that he is with the Opposition. Bergstein has never had any connection with the Opposition, neither before nor after our expulsion.

Piatnitsky's Figures

From the report of O. Piatnitsky, organizational head of the Comintern to the 10th Plenum of the E. C. C. I., we take the following excerpts which speak so eloquently for the decline of the sections of the C. I. during the period of the Stalin-Bucharin leadership of the International:

"In America in 1927, there were 166 shop nuclei and 452 street nuclei, in 1928, there were 111 shop nuclei and 468 street nuclei. Here the number of shop nuclei is also declining and the number of street nuclei increasing. In Czecho-Slovakia, there were 1301 shop nuclei in 1926, 1030 in 1927... In the Communist Party of Germany there is a high percentage of industrial workers, and the percentage of Communists working in factories and shops is certainly not less than 60 percent. How is the mass of the membership represented in the shop nuclei?... In 1927, 15 percent of the Party members belonged to shop nuclei, and in 1928, 12 percent... 47 percent of the Party membership belonged to street nuclei in 1927, and 42 percent in 1928. In the local organizations where there were no nuclei, there were 31 percent of the Party membership in 1927 and 43 percent in 1928. Thus, the number of Party members belonging to street nuclei fell from 47 percent in 1927 to 42 percent in 1928, that is, a decline of 5 percent, since a part of the Party membership moved over from the street and shop nuclei into Party organizations where there are no nuclei at all... We have very little data on the C. P. of France, but the little that we have on the basis of official Party reports, indicate that the C. P. F. had about 56,000 Party members in February 1928, of whom 17,448 were in shop nuclei, which makes 31.15 percent of the Party membership... In April 1929, the report of the Central Committee to the 6th Congress of the C. P. F. already gives the Party membership as 45,000 of whom only 24 percent still belong to shop nuclei. That is the picture of the work of the Communist Parties in the shops."

A Weekly by Nov. 7

The National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition), in conformity with the decision of our national conference in Chicago three months ago, has definitely decided upon a campaign for the launching of the Militant as the WEEKLY MILITANT on the 12th Anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution, on November 7th, 1929.

For the militant workers throughout the world, the Russian Revolution has been the main source of inspiration for the struggle against world imperialism and for the liberation of the proletariat. Constantly on the side of the Russian Revolution for the twelve years since its inception, we remain the most resolute defenders of its achievements and triumphs today as the Opposition to those in the Communist movement who undermine its foundations. It was the Russian Revolution that gave birth to the Communist International. It was the Communist International, under the genius of its immortal leaders, Lenin and Trotsky, that welded together the forces of the revolutionary militants throughout the world that had been shattered and dispersed by the treachery of the social democracy. It was the Communist International that brought a new breath of life, a new spirit of struggle and militancy into the ranks of the labor movement. It established in the first five years of its existence those basic conceptions upon which a mighty mobilization of revolutionary fighters was organized.

Under the mis-direction of the distorters of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, the Communist International has departed from the path along which its founders led it to ever-increasing strength and prestige. Under the domination of Stalin, Bucharin and their disciples throughout the International, the Communist movement has been brought to a condition today in which it lies wracked by numerous splits, by theoretical confusion, by the pernicious germ of opportunism, by loss of strength and authority in the working class. The movement needs a fresh wind, it calls for clear voices that can sound again the clarion call of those principles of Leninism upon which the International was built, that can cleanse the movement of Stalinism. It needs a re-statement of fundamentals, clarity in theory and action. It needs a resumption of the struggle for the victory of Bolshevism.

In less than a year of its existence, the Militant has carried on this struggle. The huge requirements of the present moment demand its publication as a WEEKLY MILITANT. And no more appropriate and symbolic time can be found than the 12th Anniversary of the Russian Revolution. The publication of the Militant as a WEEKLY will enable us to deal more promptly and in greater detail with the general struggle of the American and world working class, to consider its problems, to fight by its side in every daily battle against the class enemy.

Our aim of a weekly can be realized if all the branches of the League cooperate. Already the Minneapolis and Chicago branches have taken the initiative and are working to raise their quotas to insure the Weekly. Every other branch, every member, every one of our sympathizers must now concentrate upon this task. It is a big task, but we are confident of our ability to accomplish it. The struggle for Bolshevism requires hard work and big sacrifices from every militant. The forces that are swimming against the stream are being united in Russia and the rest of the world. Their American regiment will do its part in the fight.

The WEEKLY MILITANT can be begun and maintained if every supporter of the Opposition comes loyally to its support. A MILITANT SUSTAINING FUND must be got under way for the next period. The SUSTAINING FUND can be best built by every comrade making a Pledge for money to be sent in regularly for the WEEKLY MILITANT, or by sending in a donation.

PLEDGE YOUR REGULAR CONTRIBUTION NOW FOR THE WEEKLY MILITANT!

FILL OUT THIS BLANK

THE MILITANT
Box 120, Madison Square Station,
New York, N. Y.

Enclosed herewith a contribution for $..... for the WEEKLY MILITANT.

I pledge myself to make a regular contribution of $..... every week towards the SUSTAINING FUND FOR THE WEEKLY MILITANT.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... *State* .....

WICKS SPEAKS UP

A Warrior Against Trotsky

In the Daily Worker a few days ago, H. M. Wicks an editor and one of the pillars of the new Party leadership, devotes a part of his billingsgate to denouncing us as "counter-revolutionaries" and "renegades". Wicks is one of that horde of parasites who make their way in the International under Stalin by denouncing and slandering the revolutionary fighters, and Wicks, like many of the others, has had previous experience in this game which makes his task easier today. The only difference is that in earlier times they slandered us from outside the Communist ranks, while today, thanks to the temporary supremacy of Stalinism, they speak as officials of the movement. The essence of what they say about us and its import is essentially the same now as then. This newly-appointed guardian of Communism hurled just as vicious slander against us when we were fighting to build the Communist nucleus in the face of outside attacks as he does today when we are fighting against internal degeneration. In the days of the Palmer raids, when the Communists were being tested by fire, Wicks played the role of Judas. For the information of the Communist workers who are receiving their education nowadays from the Wickses, we reprint verbatim the following report contained in the Gary, Indiana, Post (now the Post-Tribune) of Thursday, March 25, 1920, pages 1 and 9:

BARES UNDERHAND 'RED' PLOT TO USE UNIONS TO RUIN UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

H. M. Wicks of Chicago, a reformed Socialist, spoke on the revolutionary tendencies of the times to some forty Gary men last evening. Mr. Wicks established a Socialist local in Gary several years ago; he said he helped select Oscar Anderson as the leader of the Gary strike; therefore he did not appear to be an entire stranger.

He charged that the steel strike was wholly the work of the syndicalist movement. Violent minorities in the steel unions forced the strike against the wishes of the majority, he said. The majorities did not want to strike but were howled down by the leather-lunged minorities whose only argument was that the opponents of the strike were agents of Judge Gary.

BREAKS WITH PARTY

Mr. Wicks has been a socialist in good standing until last fall when he openly broke with the Socialist Party. Previous to that time he had served as a member of the National Executive Committee of the Party. He said he was familiar with the work and attitude of the Socialists, I. W. W., Communists and all revolutionists.

With very few exceptions, he said, the radicals are not Americans. Most of the Socialists are people of foreign birth and citizenship and many of them do not even speak the English language.

WORK FOR AMERICAN LEGION

Bill Haywood and his satellites should not be tolerated in this country, Mr. Wicks said, he had been advising American Legion members not to permit these vermin to talk to them, but to knock them down. That, he said, is the only language they understand.

The speaker charged that the Socialist Party was thoroughly pro-German during the war and is today controlled by the pro-German Victor Berger. He said Berger richly deserved the 20 year sentence meted out some time ago and he hoped the Milwaukee man would be forced to serve his time. He said if there ever was a traitor to his country Berger was it.

NO USE FOR "REDS"

Mr. Wicks has no respect for Socialists or radicals of any sort. Having associated with them intimately for years he claims to know them exactly as they are and he says that they are all selfish opportunists who are simply after something for themselves.

He commended the deportation proceedings that have rid the country of many agitators and urged that other foreign trouble makers be given the same treatment. He urged an Americanization program for the foreign speaking workers and he said the American Legion is the one organization in the country which is doing good Americanization work.

EXPELLED FOR DEFEAT

Mr. Wicks was especially severe of the brand of democracy that the various organizations subscribe to. He said when Victor Berger and Morris Hillquit were defeated by the Party vote they simply expelled many of the Socialists who voted against them and retained control.

He told of attending the congress of the Communist Party in Chicago where by use of a caucus about one-fourth of the delegates controlled the meeting.

Lenin is a dictator, and Emma Goldman and Ben Reitman would not dare to carry on the propaganda in Russia which they did carry on here. If they did it would be a firing squad for them.

The purpose of the revolutionists today is not democracy. They want the rule of the militant minority. Mr. Wicks charged that Syndicalism had been taken up in many instances by unions. He said there is no question about the syndicalism of Foster, who was secretary of the Steel Strike organization. He said he knew Foster personally and was positive that the late strike leader had not abandoned any of his syndicalist beliefs. He also stated that the radicals were simply biding their time to call another strike.

The speaker could not find words to describe his disgust for the I. W. W. He charged them with being cowards and the scum of the earth.

Mr. Wicks is preparing to tour the country on the Chautauqua platform this summer in order to let the American people understand the true situation. He has given several years study to Sociology and is preparing to write two books on the problems of the hour.

He has broken away from the Socialists so recently that this may be the first notice some of them will have of his apostacy.

* * *

Wicks is now a "big man" in the Party leadership, one of its spokesmen, a candidate for office in New York. He is one of the regenerated Lovestoneites to whom Foster, whom "he knew personally", has been fastened to make the new Party leadership. Wicks is also an editor of the Daily Worker. Perhaps after re-reading the above press story, he will use some of the valuable space of his paper to explain why the following notice appeared in 1921 in the "Official Bulletin of the Communist Party of America (Section of the Communist International)" Issued by the General Executive Committee, No. 2, on page 1, under the heading, "Some Important C. E. C. Decisions":

"The recommendation of an investigating committee that Harry Wicks shall not be admitted to the Party was approved. The information proves him to be absolutely undesirable within the Party ranks."

We brought up this matter of Wicks and his record once before in the Party. At that time he was shielded by Lovestone and Pepper, although Lovestone, in his "Appeal to the Comintern" now admits the truth. What will the "new leadership" do about it?

Unity Front Is Broadened

In their endeavor to minimize the strength of the Lovestonite Right wing in the Party, the official Party press has "neglected" to announce the following expulsions that took place a few days ago in the Chicago district of the Party: William F. Kruse, district organizer of the Party and recent graduate of Stalin's so-called "Lenin School"; Jack Deer, Rose Cohen, and Satil Held. The two latter were members of the Young Communist League.

Furthermore, half a dozen Party and League members have been expelled, in addition to those named by the Daily Worker, for supporting Lovestone at the N. Y. membership meeting. Edward Wright has been expelled from the Party, and therefore removed from his post as business manager of the Labor Defender. While Engdahl's name is officially published as editor of the Defender, the job is actually in the hands of a quill-pusher from the Daily Worker, Sol Auerbach, who has the twin virtues of obedience and ignorance. Carl Hacker is hanging by a hair in the I.L.D., and his being suspected of Lovestone support makes it certain that he will soon find himself on the outside. Already, his post as national assistant secretary has been taken over by George Maurer, as predicted in our last issue. Even the book-keeping of the I.L.D. has been made safe for the New Line by the removal of the Lovestoneite suspect, Anna Thompson and her substitution by Julius Codkind. Our list would be incomplete if it did not include the news that Beatrice Karlin, an excellent tennis and golf player, who is consumed with pain at the sufferings of the poor working class, has been attached to the staff of the Workers School.

2 New Opposition Papers

We are glad to chronicle the appearance of two new organs of the Bolshevik Opposition, both of which are assured of splendid futures and victory over huge obstacles. One is "The Proletarian" published in Shanghai by our comrades of the Chinese Opposition. We have received the first four issues of the paper, which is in small format, averaging 48 pages per issue. It is printed on a multigraph machine. The Chinese Opposition, like the American, is one of the youngest in the International. It has tremendous difficulties in its work, since it must encounter not only the official Party but the blood-thirsty dictatorship of the Kuo Min Tang.

The other is "The Bulletin of the Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists"), published in the Russian language in Paris, for distribution mainly in the Soviet Union. It is a standard size magazine of 40 pages, and includes most of the recent writing of comrade Trotsky, letters from Moscow, and material on the problems of the International Opposition. It is the first organ of the Russian Opposition that has ever appeared. Details will be found elsewhere in this issue.

A Victory for Us in Austria

Comrade Kurt Landau, leader of the Austrian Communist Opposition, writes us as follows:

"In April, the city council elections took place in Graz, the second largest city of Austria, where we have our main organization and where our paper, 'Der Mahnruf' appears. By tremendous sacrifices, we succeeded in raising the costs of participating in the election, and received 604 votes, beating the Stalinite list, which only got 104 votes. After the elections, the government, and above all the social democracy began an intensified pressure upon our Graz organization. Our comrades there, who are mostly unemployed for many years, have had the city unemployment relief withdrawn from them. The Graz printing shops refuse to print our paper. We are now obliged to establish our paper in Vienna."

Since this was written, the official Party in Austria has experienced another of its periodical crises, once more engendered by the machinations of the Master, Stalin. The Opposition is forging ahead.

WORDS FORGOT

Yaroslavsky on Trotsky

NOTE:—The official Stalinist press has lately suffered from a renewed bombardment against comrade Trotsky by one of the arch liars in the falsification factory: Yaroslavsky. Each new contribution made by Yaroslavsky to the distortion and misrepresentation practised against the Opposition is distinguished only by its viler slanders, revolting demagogy and more outrageous defamation. That such a person could have become the leading scribbler in the Comintern against the Bolshevik-Leninists is in itself a sign of decay. Comrade Trotsky has dealt with Yaroslavsky once and for all in his masterful letter to the Bureau of Party History where he exposes a few score of the lies made "popular" by Stalin and company in recent years. We take the following excerpt from that letter.—Editor.

Nine tenths of his slanders and falsifications Yaroslavsky dedicates to the author of these lines. It would be hard to imagine lies more confused and at the same time more spiteful. Do not make the mistake of thinking, however, that Yaroslavsky always wrote this way. No, he wrote quite differently. It was just as purple, it was in just as bad taste, but to exactly the opposite effect. In the spring of 1923, Yaroslavsky devoted an article to the beginnings of the political activity of the author of these lines. The article is a tumultous panegyric, unbearable to read. It requires an effort to quote from it. Still it is necessary. In his character of inquisitor, Yaroslavsky takes a voluptuous pleasure in bringing face to face on the witness-stand Communists guilty of distributing the Testament of Lenin, the letters of Lenin on the national question, and other illegal documents in which Lenin dared to criticize Stalin. Let us bring Yaroslavsky face to face with himself.

HOW YAROSLAVSKY ONCE WROTE

"The brilliant literary-publicistic activity of comrade Trotsky,"—so Yaroslavsky wrote in 1923,—"gained him the world-wide name of 'Prince of Pamphleteers.' The English writer Bernard Shaw described him thus. Whoever has followed his activity during the course of a quarter of a century, cannot but be convinced that this talent of the pamphleteer and polemist developed, grew, and blossomed with especial brilliancy during the years of our proletarian revolution. But even at the dawn of his activity, it was observable that we had before us an endowment most profound. All his newspaper articles were saturated with inspiration, they all partook of imagery, color, although they had to be written within the jaws of the vise of the czarist censorship, which defaced the bold thought and the bold form of every one who wished to escape from the grip of those jaws and raise himself above the common level. But so great were the ripening underground forces, so strongly was felt the beating of the heart of the awakening people, so sharp were the developing contradictions, that all the censors in the world could not stamp out the creative power of such a shining individual personality as was already in those days the figure of L. D. Trotsky.

"Probably many have seen the quite widely distributed photograph of the youth Trotsky when he was first sentenced to exile in Siberia—that boisterous head of hair, those characteristic lips and lofty brow. Under that head of hair, under that lofty brow, was boiling even then a turbulent stream of images, thoughts, moods—sometimes diverting comrade Trotsky a little from the great road of history, compelling him sometimes to choose a too long way round, or, on the other hand, to cut his way fearlessly through where it was inadvisable to go. *But in all these searchings we had before us a deeply devoted revolutionary man, born to the role of tribune,* with a tongue sharply whetted and flexible as steel, slaughtering his enemies, and a pen scattering in handfuls (!) like artistic pearls the riches of his thought."

A "LEADER OF THE REVOLUTION"!

And further: "The articles at our disposal embrace a period of more than two years—from October 15, 1900, to September 12, 1902. The Siberian comrades read with delight these brilliant articles and awaited their appearance with impatience. Only a few knew who was the author, and those knowing him never guessed in those days that he would be *one of the recognized leaders of the most revolutionary army and of the greatest revolution in the world.*"

And finally the conclusion:

"His protest against the pessimism of the de-magnetized Russian intelligentzia (Ahem!) comrade Trotsky established later. Not in words, but in deeds he established it, shoulder to shoulder with the revolutionary proletariat of the great proletarian revolution. For this great powers were needed. The Siberian village did not destroy in him these powers. It only further convinced him of the necessity of radically breaking, to the foundation, that whole structure in which the facts described by him were possible." (*Siberian Fires*, Nos. 1 and 2, January and April 1923).

Although in some of his more recent appreciations comrade Yaroslavsky may have rounded the circle at 180 degrees, we must confess that in one respect he remains exactly the same: he is equally unbearable in slander and in praise.

The Sino-Russian Conflict and the Opposition

By L. D. TROTSKY

On July 27th, I gave the following answer to a questionaire of an American news agency:

"As to Soviet-Chinese relations, I can voice my opinion, of course, only in the capacity of a private individual. Outside of the newspapers, I have no access to sources of information. In such matters, newspaper reports are always unsatisfactory. There can be no doubt that aggression is being manifested by the Chinese and not by the Russian government. The regime of the Chinese Eastern Railway is a fact that dates back a number of years. Those workers' organizations that have been attacked by the Chinese government do not exist since yesterday either. The organization of the Chinese Eastern Railway lines was based on the thoroughgoing work executed by a special committee of which I was the chairman. The resolutions passed by this committee were ratified in April 1926. They protect Chinese interests in every respect.

"The attitude of the present Chinese regime may be explained by the fact that it has become strong by reason of its defeat of the workers and peasants. What caused the defeat of the revolutionary movement of the Chinese people—of this I am not going to speak here since I have given a full account of these causes in articles already published. Governments that have emerged from crushed revolutions usually display weakness before those forces against which the revolution was directed. In this case, first of all before English and Japanese imperialism. For this reason, the Chinese government, in order to show its strength, had to make a threatening, adventurist gesture towards its revolutionary neighbor.

"The question is whether this provocation growing out of the defeat of the Chinese revolution will of necessity result in war. I do not think so, *because the Soviet government does not want war and the Chinese cannot make war.*

"Chiang Kai-Shek's army achieved victories in 1925-27 thanks to the uprising of the masses. However, when the army turned against them, it forfeited its main source of strength. As a purely military organization, his army is extremely weak. Chiank Kai-Shek cannot help knowing that the Soviet government is well aware of the weakness of his armed forces. It is beyond his power to wage war against the Red Army *without the help of other countries.* In other words, he could fight Russia only if his army were a subsidiary of other armies. I do not believe that such a combination is likely at the present time, chiefly because of the circumstance that the Soviet government is seriously bent upon straightening out things by peaceful means.

"It goes without saying that were the Soviets to engage in war, the opposition would devote itself completely to the defense of the October revolution."

I believed that in this answer I had expressed the standpoint of the whole Left Communist Opposition. I regret to say that this is not altogether the case. Individuals and groups have come forward in the opposition that, on the occasion of the first serious political test, have taken either an indecisive or a basically false stand, opposed to their own revolutionary opposition camp, and one which brought them very near to the camp of the social democracy.

In No. 26 of the Fahne des Kommunismus, there was printed an article written by one H. P. According to this article the conflict was caused by an encroachment upon China's right of self-determination on the part of the Soviet republic; in other words, it was in substance a defense of Chiang Kai-Shek I shall not deal with this article, since H. P. received a proper reply from comrade Kurt Landau, who dealt with the question as behooves a Marxist.

The editor of the Fahne des Kommunismus printed the article as a discussion article, with a note that he is not in solidarity with the author. It is completely beyond comprehension how it is possible to open a discussion on so elementary a question for every revolutionary, particularly at a time when we need political action. Matters became even worse when the editor of that paper published Landau's contribution also as a "discussion article." The article of H. P. expresses the prejudices of vulgar democracy combined with those of anarchism. Landau's article formulates the Marxist standpoint. And what about the viewpoint of the editor.

Something incomparably worse occurred in one of the numerous groups of the French Opposition. No. 35 of Contre le Courant (dated July 28, 1929), devotes an editorial to the Soviet-Chinese conflict which is a sorry mess of errors from beginning to end, partly of social democratic, partly of ultra-Left hue. The article begins with the statement that the adventurist policy of the Soviet bureaucracy is responsible for the conflict, in other words, the paper assumes the role of Chiank Kai-Shek's defense attorney. The article puts the policy of the Soviets towards the Chinese Eastern Railway in the category of a capitalist, imperialist policy, which resorts to the support of the imperialist powers.

"The Communist Opposition", the article states, "cannot aid Stalin's war, which is not a defensive war of the proletariat but a semi-colonial war." Elsewhere it says: "The Opposition must have the courage *to tell the working class that it is not falling into line with Stalinist bureaucrats, is not for their adventurist war.*" This phrase is emphasized in the original, and not by accident: it expresses the whole essence of the article and thereby puts the author into implacable opposition to the whole of the Communist Left.

In what sense is the Stalinist bureaucracy responsible for the present conflict? In this sense and no other: that it helped Chiang Kai-Shek by its previous policy to destroy the revolution of the Chinese workers and peasants. I spoke of this in an article directed against Radek and company: "Chiang Kai- Shek's provocation is the reward for Stalin's assistance in crushing the Chinese revolution. I say it now, and I have repeated it a hundred times, that as soon as Chiang Kai-Shek will be seated securely in the saddle to which he was aided by Stalin, the former will on the first occasion kick his assistant in the face with his stirrup. This is precisely what happened."

Chiang Kai-Shek's provocation was preceded by his crushing of the Chinese revolution. We behold here an adventure of the Bonapartist military power headed by Chiang Kai-Shek. This provocation is at the root of the Soviet-Chinese conflict.

According to the author of the article quoted, the principal cause of the conflict is the imperialist "claim" of the Soviet republic on the Chinese Eastern line. Hands Off China! shout the involuntary defenders of Chiang Kai-Shek, repeating not only the slogans but also the basic arguments of the social democrats. Heretofore we believed that only the capitalist bourgeoisie as a class could be the representatives of an imperialist policy. Is there anything to indicate the contrary? Or has such a class taken over power in the U. S. S. R.? Since when? We are fighting against the Centrism of the Stalinist bureaucracy (and remember: Centrism is a movement within the working class itself), because Centrist policies *may help* the bourgeoisie to gain power, first the petty and middle bourgeoisie, and eventually—finance capital. Herein lies the historical danger, although this is a process that is by no means at the point of completion.

In the same issue of Contre le Courant, the socalled draft of a platform is published. In this we read among other things: "We cannot say that the Thermidor has already come." This shows that a continual repetition of the general formulae of the Opposition is far from being equivalent to a political understanding of those formulae. If we cannot say that the Thermidor is an accomplished fact, neither can we say that Soviet policy has become a capitalist, or imperialist, policy. Centrism is a zig-zag between the proletariat and the petty-bourgeoisie. To identify Centrism with big capital means to understand nothing at all, and thereby support finance capital not only against the proletariat, but also against the petty bourgeoisie.

The theoretical wisdom of the ultra-Leftists in Berlin and in Paris simmers down to a few democratic abstractions, which have a geographical but not a socialist basis. The Chinese Eastern Railway runs through Manchuria, which belongs to China. China has a right to self-determination, therefore ,the claim of Soviet Russia to this line is imperialism. They should be turned over. To whom? To Chiang Kai-Shek? Or to the son of Chang Tso-Lin?

In the course of the Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations von Kuehlmann demanded an independent Latvia and Esthonia, referring to the fact that the Landtags established there with the aid of Germany had instructed him to demand a separation. We refused to sanction this, and we were denounced by the entire official press of Germany as imperialists.

Let us assume that in the Caucasus there is an outbreak of a counter-revolution which, with the help of —say—England, achieves victory. Let us also assume that the workers of Baku, with the help of the Soviet Union, succeed in keeping the whole district of Baku in their power. It goes without saying that the Transcaucasian counter-revolution would then claim this district of Baku. It is perfectly clear that the Soviet Republic would not consent to this. Is it not also clear that in such a case the enemy would accuse the Soviets of imperialism?

Had the revolution of the Chinese workers and peasants been victorious, there would not be any difficulty whatsoever now with regard to the Chinese Eastern lines. These lines would have been turned over to the hands of the victorious Chinese people. But the fact of the matter is that the Chinese people were defeated by the ruling Chinese bourgeoisie, and with the aid of foreign imperialism. To turn over the lines to the hand of Chiang Kai-Shek under such conditions would mean to abet the Chinese Bonapartist counter-revolution against the Chinese people. This alone settles the whole issue. There is still another consideration of equal weight. Chiang Kai-Shek never could get those lines by virtue of his own financial political means—let alone keep them. It is by no means an accident that he tolerates the actual independence of Manchuria existing under a Japanese protectorate. The railway lines transferred to Chiang Kai-Shek would only become a becurity for the foreign loans which he received. They would go over into the hands of the real imperialists and would become their most important economic and strategic line in the Far East —against a potential Chinese revolution and against the Soviet republic. We are well aware that the imperialists understand perfectly how to utilize the slogan of self-determination for their own dirty deals. But I do not believe that Marxists are under any obligations to help them put it over.

The point of departure for the ultra-Lefts is the fact that it was greedy and thievish czarist imperialism which once took the Chinese Eastern lines from the Chinese people. This is a fact that cannot be argued. Yet, they forget to point out that the same imperialism had forced itself upon the Russian people. Yes, those lines were constructed for the purpose of robbing the Chinese workers and peasants. But they were also constructed by the exploitation and robbery of the Russian workers and peasants. After this the October revolution took place. Did this alter the mutual relations of these peoples? On the foundation of the revolution, after a period of reaction, the state structure was rebuilt. Did Russia now return to the starting point? Can we now imagine, from a historical viewpoint—regardless of Stalin and Molotov, regardless of the exile of the Opposition, etc., etc.,—can we imagine an ownership of the Chinese Eastern lines that would be more beneficial from the point of view of the international proletariat and the Chinese revolution, than that of the Soviet Union? This is how we ought to put the question.

All the White guard emigres look upon this question not from a nationalist or a geographical viewpoint, but from a class angle. Regardless of internal dissension, the leading groups of the Russian emigres are in accord on the point that the internationalization of the Chinese Eastern, i. e., its transference to the hands of world imperialism, would to be the advantage of the "coming", that is, of Bourgeois Russia, more advantageous than to leave it in the possession of the Soviet state. By the same token, we can say that to leave it in the hands of the Soviet power would be more advantageous to an independent China than to turn it over to any of the present claimants.

* * *

Does this signify that the management of the lines is perfect? No! Indeed not. The remnants of czarist imperialism still have some strength there. All the zig-zags of internal policy are undoubtedly also reflected in the apparatus of the lines. The tasks of the Opposition extend also over these questions.

I would like to refer here to my personal experience in this matter. More than once did I have to fight for an improvement in the management of the Chinese railways. The last time I worked on this question was in a special committee of which I was chairman in March 1926. The members of this committee were Voroschilov, Dzjershinsky and Tchitcherin. In full agreement with the Chinese revolutionaries, not only the Communists but the representatives of the at that time functioning Kuo Min Tang, the committee deemed it absolutely necessary:

"To retain the actual management of the railway in the hands of the Soviet power as the only means of safeguarding the lines from seizure by the imperialists in the next period." "The next period" meant—until the victory of the Chinese revolution. With regard to the regime in the interim, the resolution adopted on the question had this to say:

"It is absolutely necessary to adopt broad measures of a cultural-political character with regard to the *Chinafication* of the railroad.

") The management shall be conducted both in the Chinese and Russian languages;

"b) A Chinese school for railroad workers shall be established combing technical and political education;

"c) At appropriate points on the railway lines, educational institutions shall be established for the benefit of the Chinese workers and the population in the vicinity."

With regard to the policy of the Russian representatives towards China, the resolution said:

"There can be no doubt that with regard to China, the representatives of the various departments were guilty of impermissable activities that bore the character of an imperialist attitude which compromised the Soviet Power and suggested the idea of imperialism.

"The responsible organs and personnel of the railway must be impressed with the necessity of such a policy, and the importance even of the external forms of such a policy, towards China, as shall preclude the slightest shadow of imperialist conceptions. In every department a line shall be followed which will be based on the highest consideration for an understanding of the rights of China, on the recognition and emphasis of its sovereignty, etc. In each case where a violation of such policy shall occur, irrespective of how great or small such a violation may be, the guilty shall be punished and care taken that the proceedings be brought to the attention of Chinese public opinion."

In addition to this I must point to the fact that the Chinese owners of he railway, Chiang Kai-Shek included, put against the management of the railway, not the Chinese, but mainly the White Guardist apparatus that is on the payroll of the imperialists of the world. The White Guards employed in the police and military squads of the Chinese railway have frequently committed acts of violence against the railway workers. Regarding this, the resolution passed by the committee of that time, said the following:

"...It is absolutely necessary to investigate every future case in which Chinese military, police, or Russian White Guards commit violence on Russian workers and officials of the railway, and every case in which conflicts occurred between Russians and Chinese for nationalist reasons. Ways and means must be found so that the personal and national feelings of these Russian workers shall be dealt with in such a manner that conflicts of this kind shall not kindle chauvinist instincts in either Party (Russian or Chinese); on the contrary, they shall be used as the occasion for political education. Special conciliation committees, or courts, shall be established in unions, into which members of both nationalities shall enter and act upon the basis of equal rights. They shall be guided by serious-minded Communists who are fully aware of

the importance and the antagonism that accompanies nationalist sentiments."

I believe that all this is a far cry from imperialism. I believe that here is a good chance for the ultra-Lefts to learn something. I am also ready to admit that not all of our resolutions have been carried out. There were probably more unlawful acts on the railway lines than in Moscow. That is precisely the reason why the Opposition wages an implacable struggle. Yet it is a poor politician who throws out the child with the water when the bath is over.

I have already shown the sense in which the Stalinist faction was responsible for Chiang Kai-Shek's provocations. But even if we assume that Stalin's bureaucrats have acted foolishly again, and have thereby helped the enemy to strike a blow against the Soviet republic, what conclusions should we draw? Perhaps the conclusion that we must not defend the Soviet Republic? or the conclusion that we must liberate it from Stalinist leadership. The editorial of Contre le Courant has outrageously come to the first conclusion, stating that we must not support Stalin's bureaucracy and its adventurist war. As though in such an event the Stalinist bureaucracy would be at stake and not the October revolution and its potentialities. In order to parade more of its wisdom, the editorial goes on to say: "It is not up to the Opposition to prepare some special remedy in the present crisis." We cannot immagine a worse standpoint. This is not the view of a revolutionary, but of a disinterested spectator. What shall the Russian revolutionary do? What shall the fighters of the Opposition do in case of war? Shall they perhaps take a neutral position? The author of the editorial does not seem to think of this. And that because of not being guided by the viewpoint of a revolutionary who will unconditionally enlist in the war, but because of proceeding like a notary who records the actions of both parties without intervening.

The Stalinists have reproached us more than once for being defeatists, or defenders on certain conditions. I spoke on this subject on August 1, 1927, at the joint plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission. I said:

"Whoever accuses us of defending the Soviet Union on conditions, we herewith brand as liars and slanderers."

In this way I repudiated the idea of neutrality and conditional defense, called it a slander and hurled this slander back into the teeth of the Stalinists. Did the author of the editorial fail to notice this? And if he did not fail—why did he not attack me? The speech to which I refer was printed in my recent book, published in French under the title "The Distorted Revolution."

When I delivered my speech, I did not deal with some specific war, but with any war that might be waged against the Soviet Republic. Only an ignoramus will fail to see from the combination of the preceding events a basic antagonism between the imperialist powers and Soviet Russia. Yes, in the question of my visa the imperialists are in cheerful accord with Stalin. But when it comes to the question of the Soviet republic, they all remain its mortal enemies, *irrespective of Stalin.* Every war would expose this antagonism and would inevitably result in endangering the very existence of the Soviet Union. For this reason I said in my speech quoted above:

"Are we, the Opposition, in any doubt on the question of defending the Socialist Fatherland? Not in the slightest degree. We hope not only to defend it but to teach others how to defend it. Have we any doubt on the ability of Stalin to take a correct line of defense for the Socialist Fatherland? We have, and this in the highest degree.

"The Opposition is for the victory of the U. S. S. R. It has proved, and will prove, no worse than the others. As to Stalin, that is another matter. Stalin, in fact, has something else in mind, which he dares not express. That is , Does the Opposition think that Stalin's regime is incapable of securing victory for the U. S. S. R.? Indeed, such is their opinion!"

Zinoviev: *"Correct!"*

"Not a single Oppositionist will renounce his right and duty, on the eve of war or during its course, to fight for the correction of the Party line—then and always—because this is the most important pre-requisite for victory. I will sum up: We are for the Socialist Fatherland, but we are not for the Stalinist course."

I believe that this position retains its full strength in the present moment as well.

L. D. TROTSKY.

Constantinople, August 4, 1929.

The Industrial Situation

By Arne Swabeck

Ever more the strike movements give evidence of working class exasperation from deep seated grievances, of rebellion against the increased class pressure in industry. They foreshadow the trend of the American workers toward a more definite class position and toward a class movement. They indicate the great possibilities becoming available for militant unionism.

THE TEXTILE WORKERS

Naturally the struggles of the workers in the Southern territory command the major attention. A newly developed industrial proletariat in rebellion against the rapidly established capitalist trustified industry, with its intense exploitation, is of the greatest significance. Not only are the unorganized textile workers engaging in this revolt, but even members of such conservative craft unions as the street carmen of New Orleans go into action against the employers with organization sentiment ripening amongst the workers everywhere in these states.

The shameful sell-out by the officials of the United Textile Workers Union of the strikers of Elizabethton, Tenn., is not the end there. These workers will again take up the fight. In the other little Southern mill towns spontaneous strikes of the unorganized workers occur almost continually. The most militant fight has unquestionably been made by the Gastonia workers under the leadership of the National Textile Workers Union. But for the time being the mill barons have succeeded through the celebrated murder frame-up tactics of American capitalism in putting the movement on the defensive. But the misery of the workers increases their deep-rooted discontent grows and it will be a matter only of time when they will again be able to resume the offensive. With united support of the American working class that day will arrive so much sooner.

It is unquestionably due to this aggressive, militant struggle led by the Communists at Gastonia, combined with the ruthless pressure upon the workers by the mill bosses that the officials of the United Textile Workers have decided to exploit the growing union sentiment in its announced intention to carry on an organization campaign throughout the Southern states. But their actual efforts, as already demonstrated in the Elizabethton betrayal, will be to lead this sentiment into channels safe for capitalism.

ON THE RAILROADS

Among the railroad workers growing militancy has been demonstrated of recent date in determined rank and file votes for strike to adjust their grievances. Held back however, by conservative craft prejudices and class collaboration practices nothing has so far gone beyond the usual procedure of arbitration. Yet the demand made by the railroad brotherhoods for the six hour day can only be ascribed to the increasing pressure of the rank and file upon the officialdom. Reasons for this pressure can easily be found in the fact that during the last eight years the combined roads of the country have cut their working force by 180,000 men; that in 1928 the total payroll was 90 million dollars below that of 1927 with an increase in profits of 108 million dollars; in the further fact of the corresponding heavy increase of speed-up, loss of union conditions, governmental action to defeat the workers and the general failure of the union leadership.

In the general working class condition the picture is a similar one, however, with the exploitation of the large masses of unskilled workers being much more intense. The U. S. department of labor reports that in 1928 there were fewer factory jobs than in any previous year since 1921 while payroll totals reached the lowest level since 1924. The reduction in the employment average since 1923, shown by the department, represent loss of jobs to more than 1,000,000 workers.

BUILDING AND AUTOMOBILES

Building activities according to the Commercial and Financial Chronicle in a report, covering 354 of the largest cities shows a decline for 1928 compared to 1925 of $878,477,171 or about 20 percent. In addition the workers are faced with a rapid mechanization of the industry with machinery replacing labor and hand-tools, all of the material used being entirely finished in the factories mostly under non-union conditions. Thus even the privileged position of these skilled workers divided by craft prejudices, craft union barriers and reactionary corrupt leadership is being thratened, compelling an orientation towards new methods and forms of struggle.

It is understandable that the capitalist institutions view with considerable concern the "uncertain" situation in the automobile industry. In Detroit the per capita earnings of the auto workers decreased 8.5 per cent during 1928. Men over 45 years of age can find no jobs, unemployment is growing, layoffs and hiring at lower wages has become routine. Speedup is constantly increasing; among the workers discontent is spreading and is manifested in repeated strikes and growing sentiment for organization. In the latest report of the Student Industrial Commission we find a summary of these conditions as follows: "With all these shop strikes before us; with all this boiling indignation bursting on our ears; with men in discontented mobs gathering before factory employment offices, we see no other alternative than unionism. Human nature will stand just so much, then it breaks over the dams and overflows. One day this is going to happen in Detroit."

With the same tempo of these developments the trade union bureaucrats in general are moving constantly in the opposite direction, further to the right. They are proceeding to more bitter denunciations of militant tactics and of the Communists, increasing their betrayals and strengthening the fortifications of the capitalist system. Just now when the Gastonia strike leaders are facing framed up murder charges and execution the A. F. of L. Executive Council is again broadcasting its "warnings" to the affiliated unions not to give any money to "such Communistic organizations" as the I. L. D., the W. I. R. and the National Textile Workers Union, condemning with the Communists also the "Conference for Progressive Labor Action". This becomes so much more brazenly reactionary in view of the fact that the Southern struggles involve not merely the right to strike under Communist leadership but the right of any and all strikes, of any and all workers organization.

But it is not merely the budding Southern industrial oligarchy which pursues such savage methods of repression against its unorganized workers. At the almost opposite end of the pole, among the craft conservative building trades workers, we saw this Spring the threat of a lockout by the employers against the whole of the building trades of New York, directed mainly against their struggle for the five day week, a threat which is sure to be renewed at a more "opportune" time.

THE RIPENING MOVEMENT

Thus the objective possibilities, the response to which can be noted both among the unorganized masses of workers as well as those within the trade unions, are slowly ripening for the building of a class movement of the American workers. The surest signs appear in the moves of the heavily exploited section of the workers in the basic industries. To unite these beginning struggles and give them organized expression is the particular task of the left wing. There is no other force able to lead and inaugurate the movement for building of new unions of the unorganized workers and to crash through the barriers of craft conservatism and capitalist ideology among the masses in the unions, winning them for class policies. To us this is axiomatic To the working class, however, it must be proven and false steps will lead to isolation instead of broadening and increasing of the left influence.

The present policies pursued by the Party and the T. U. E. L. represent such false steps. The contradictions of these policies are already appearing. Thus the force of events has already compelled a certain modification of the original policy for the "Cleveland Unity Congress" away from the building of a center in the sense of a new trade union federation and more toward the correct attitude of building a left center as an organizing instrument. But they have not yet changed the "new line".

THE "NEW LINE" AND LENINISM

This "new line", non-Marxian and non-Leninist in conception, leads to splitting and the isolation of the small left wing and its followers as is now actually the result where the left wing appears today. Refusal to "draw these masses, now just awakening to the need for organization and struggle, into the A. F. of L." Refusal to "try to affiliate them collectively through the new unions to the A. F. of L.", separating the left wing from the now appearing progressive movement which, no matter how vacillating and spineless the leaders, nevertheless represents pressure from below as well as commands a following. In reality the "new line" means to withdraw entirely from the existing unions despite all protestations to the contrary.

With the masses awakening, the role of the existing unions having a mass basis will be of so much more importance no matter how reactionary their leadership. To direct this awakening toward the building of a class movement the left wing must work among the masses everywhere and closely co-ordinate its work within the old unions with that among the unorganized workers. Only when going hand in hand can it succeed.

Moreover, only through a broad united front organized with all forecs ready to work toward a class movement—for militant unionism, exposing and fighting bitterly all self-seeking phrase—mongering aspirants to leadership, can the left wing become a real factor and prove its worth and capacity for leadership to the masses. But this is the opposite of the present Stalinist "new line"—this is the Leninist line.

A Gangster Assault

AN OPPOSITIONIST BEATEN IN THE UNION OFFICE

On Monday, August 19, comrade Nathan Berman, a member of the Communist League, went to the office of the Joint Board of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union in New York, to pay his dues, amounting to $5.25. Berger, a leading Party member in the Union, greeted Berman as follows: "Hey, skunk, do you still belong to the Trotsky faction?"

Before Berman could do a thing, he was seized and held fast by three Stalinists, while Berger slugged him in the mouth till he bled. None of the Union officials protested.

On the way out of the office, Weiss, another leading Stalinist in the union and one of the heads of the cloak department, told Berman to "get the hell out of here". Berger was taken into the inner office while Berman was driven out.

Comrade Berman joined the Union in 1913, upon his arrival in this country. He joined the Communist Party in 1921, while it was still underground, and was expelled from it last year for refusing to vote for the expulsion of the Opposition. He was a supporter of the Left wing in the Union from the beginning, and a regular member of the T.U.E.L. In 1927 he was stabbed on the picket line five times by Right wing gangsters, in the breast, the back and the hand, and he has been under the doctor's care since that time because of the profuse loss of blood.

It is characteristic of the present struggle against the Communist Opposition that comrade Berman, a victim of the thugs of the Right wing and a staunch fighter for the Left wing union by a Berger, who deserted the fight during a strike. Comrade Berman was not driven away from the movement by Right wing gunmen and he will not be driven away by Stalinist thugs who copy their methods. But what have Zimmerman and Gold to say about this, what do Foster, Wicks and Weinstone, who are clamoring against the "gangsterism and burglaries of Lovestone", have to say about the gangsterism they use against Communist workers who support the Opposition.

Who Is Leading the Comintern To-day?

By L. D. Trotsky

WARSKI

The past of Warski is infinitely more serious. For many years he marched behind Rosa Luxemburg, while Valetsky always looked upon her with the blind hatred of a Polish chauvinist. But Warski assimilated more the weak sides of Rosa Luxemburg than her strong sides, the best of which was its revolutionary inflexibility. In the end, Warski has remained to this day the "revolutionary" social democrat of the old type. This brought him close to Klara Zetkin, as could be seen clearly in the attitude they both took to the German events of 1923. Warski never felt himself quite at ease in Bolshevism. That explains his momentary "conciliationism", based on a misunderstanding, towards the Opposition of 1923. But as soon as the lines became established, Warski found his natural place in the official ranks. The struggle of the epigones against the "permanent revolution" and the "under-estimation" of the peasantry led the timorous Warski to view the victorious uprising of Pilsudski as a sort of "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" and to drive the Polish Communists to support the Fascist coup d'Etat. This solitary example gives the measure of the Marxist perspicacity and the revolutionary firmness of Warski. It is needless to say that after "recognizing his mistakes", he is today one of the pillars of Stalinism. How this old companion of Rosa Luxemburg—that internationalist to the bottom of her heart—teaches the Polish workers the construction of socialism in one country, I do not know. But it is highly doubtful if people of this type can teach the Polish workers how to wrest power from the bourgeoisie.

Let us, however, return to the central apparatus of the International which Warski has left since he became a deputy in the Sejm.

KLARA ZETKIN

For a long time Klara Zetkin has been a purely decorative figure of the presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. One would not have to use this cruel characterization if Zetkin did not serve as a pathetic cloak for the methods that compromise not only herself, but also bring the greatest injury to the cause of the international proletariat. The strength of Zetkin was always her temperament. She never had any independence of thought. For a long time Rosa Luxemburg was her political pivot. Afterwards she looked for a new pivot in Paul Levi, and to a certain extent in Brandler.

After the days of March 1921, Zetkin did not simply revolt against the "supidities of Bela Kun", but she defended essentially the "old, tested policy" of the incessant accumulation of forces. In a conversation that Lenin and I had with her, Lenin said to her, mildly but insistently: "The young ones will commit many stupidities, but they will nevertheless make a good revolution". Zetkin exclaimed excitedly: "They will not even make a bad one." Lenin and I looked at each other and were unable to restrain our laughter.

The brief and vague half-sympathies of Zetkin for the Opposition of 1923 were aroused only because I was against throwing the blame of the International for the German catastrophe of 1923 on to the Brandler group. During 1923, Zetkin showed all the traits of the good old social democracy: she understood neither the brusque change in the situation nor the necessity for a bold change in policy. In the main, Zetkin takes no part in the solution of questions. But her traditional authority is necessary as a veil for the Manuilskys, the Peppers and the Heinz Neumanns.

SMERAL

Among the men who in this last period lead the work of the International from within the presidium of the Executive, not the lowest rank is occupied by the representative of the Czecho-Slovak Communist Party, Smeral, who has today also become one of the inflexible knights of neo-Bolshevism. Smeral and inflexibility, that is the same as Tartuffe and sincerity, or Shylock and unselfishness. Smeral has passed through the solid Austrian school, and if he is to be distinguished from the Austro-Marxist type it is only by the fact that he has never risen to it. In the old Czech social democracy Smeral was in a semi-opposition, the nature of which was so much the more difficult to grasp since the "ideas" of Smeral always gave the impression of a spreading oil stain. One can say that Smeral opposed to the Czech social-nationalism of a Nemetz et tutti quanti an Austro-Hungarian imperialist state power inspired by Renner, but without Renner's knowledge and talent. The Czech republic was realized in the meantime—not as the fruit of the policy of Benes, Kramarsc and Nemetz, but as the bastard product of the work of Anglo-French imperialism. However it may be, Czecho-Slovakia made its appearance and the Austro-Hungarian Smeral landed in a political blind alley. Whither now? There were not a few workers who, in the beginning, were intoxicated with the Czecho-Slovakian state. There were still more workers whose hearts beat towards the Russia of October. But there were none who grieved after the Austro-Hungarian empire. In the meanwhile, Smeral made his pilgrimage to Moscow. I remember how I disclosed the psychological mechanism of Smeral's Bolshevism to Lenin. Lenin repeated with a thoughtful smile: "It is probable . . you know, it is very probable . . . Many like that will come to us now. We must keep our eyes open. They must be watched at every step."

Smeral was profoundly convinced that the renaming of the Czech Party a Communist Party exhausted the question. At any rate, he did everything in his power to justify further the saying of Otto Bauer on the two good social democratic Parties in Europe: the Austrian social democracy and the Czech Communist Party. This year's "Red Day" has shown with a tragic éclat that five years of Zinovievist, Bucharinist, Stalinist and Smeralist "Bolshevization" have given the Party, that is, its leadership, in the first place, nothing—absolutely nothing. But in return Smeral has taken root. The deeper the leadership of the International sank ideologically, the higher Smeral rose. Such people constitute an excellent political barometer. It is hardly necessary to say for that this patented "Bolshevik" we Oppositionists are avowed opportunists. But the Czech workers should be told clearly that Smeral will never lead them to the conquest of power.

KOLAROV

Another variety of the same type that has been bred in these last five years in the Hotel Lux is Kolarov. His past is more serious by the fact that for a long time he belonged to the Tesniaki ("Narrow") Bulgarian Party which endeavored to remain on Marxist ground. But in spite of its apparent intransigeance, it was a Marxism of expectant propaganda, a passive and tolerably inert Marxism. As for the rest, in international questions the Tesniaki inclined much more toward Plechanov than toward Lenin. The ruin of Bulgaria in the imperialist war, then the October revolution, drove them to Bolshevism. Kolarov settled in Moscow. In the first years that followed the revolution, we jumped avidly at every foreign Marxist, or rather at every one whom we supposed to be a revolutionary Marxist. By virtue of this Kolarov was drawn into the apparatus of the International as a possible general secretary. But a few months later we had to abandon our hopes unanimously. Lenin summed up his impression of Kolarov in terms that I do not want to write down here. In 1923, Kolarov again demonstrated his limits in the Bulgarian events. The same result. While Lenin was still alive it had been decided to remove Kolarov from any leading role in the International. But after the illness and the death of Lenin came the revived struggle against Trotskyism. Kolarov plunged into this bath at the first onset and emerged from it regenerated. He marched first with Zinoviev against Trotsky, then with Bucharin against Zinoviev; today he marches with Stalin against Bucharin. In a word, he is a water-tight, uninflammable, unsinkable Bolshevik of the Lux.

KUUSINEN

Kuusinen is one of those who killed the Finnish revolution of 1918. Under the pressure of events and the masses, Kuusinen, in spite of his better judgment, found himself constrained to accept the revolution, but like a good Philistine he wanted to trim it according to the best vegetarian model. During the insurrection, with that eloquence that is all his own, he invited the good public to remain at home so that there would be no victims. If, as in Hungary, events had thrown power at his very feet, he would not have bent down immediately to pick it up. But no one threw power to him. It had to be conquered. The situation was exceptionally favorable. Only revolutionary audacity and a desire to attack were needed. In other words, those qualities were needed of which Kuusinen is the living negation. He showed himself literally incapable of taking the offensive against the Finnish bourgeoisie who were then able to drown the heroic insurrection in blood. But in return Kuusinen gave proof of some aggressive tendencies towards the Left wing of the International, after he examined himself and discovered that, in the words of Shakespeare, he was no worse than those who were no better than he. Here, he risked nothing. He swam with the stream like those who commanded him. The petty logician became a great intrigant. Of the lies used by the epigones to poison the mind of the international working class in these last years, it can be said that Kuusinen took the lion's share. That may seem paradoxical. But it sometimes happens that the lion's share falls to the hare. As was shown by his report on the colonial question at the Sixth Congress, Kuusinen has remained exactly the same as when he helped the Finnish bourgeisie to slaughter the Finnish proletariat, and the Chinese proletariat.

PETROVSKY-BENNETT

A very active role is now played in the International by such a person as Petrovsky-Bennett. It is individuals of this kind who decide today, since the official "leaders", aside from their competence, do not bother themselves, so to speak, with the questions of the International. Practically, it is the Petrovskys who direct, taking good care to cover themselves, that is by getting an authorized indorsement for themselves whenever wanted. But we will see that further on.

Petrovsky is a Bundist-Menshevik, American type, of the worst kind. For a long time he was one of the pillars of the miserable and pitiful Jewish yellow socialist journal in New York, which became enraptured with the victories of the Germans before it licked the boots of Wilson. Back to Russia in 1917, Petrovsky moved in the same Bundist-Menshevik circles. Like Guralsky, like Rafes, he rallied to Bolshevism only after the Bolsheviks had conquered power. He showed himself to be a diligent and adroit official in the military work, but nothing more than an official. The deceased Frunze, an excellent soldier, but one who was not distinguished by any keen political judgement, told me more than once: "Petrovsky smells terrible of Bundism." Not only in the questions of military administration, but also in political questions, Petrovsky invariably aligned himself with his superiors. More than once I said in jest to my deceased friend Skliansky that Petrovsky is "trying" too hard to support me. Skliansky, who valued the practical qualities of Petrovsky and therefore defended him, replied to this complaint jokingly: "Nothing can be done about it; it's his nature." And, as a matter of fact, it is not a question of careerism in the narrow sense of the word, but of an instinct for self-sufficient adaptation, for downright mimickry, for organic opportunism.

Rafes, another variety of the same type, proved himself just as capable of being a minister of Petlura as of being councilor of the Chinese revolution. To what extent he contributed to the death of Petluraism by his support I will not judge. But that he did everything he could to lose the Chinese revolution is proved by every line of his reports and his articles.

TO BE CONTINUED

Hey! What's This?

We are amazed and stunned by the new alliance that the Party has made. From the letterhead of the "Reception Committee for the Soviet Fliers, Auspices of Friends of the Soviet Union", we find that along with a list of Party notables on the committee there are such notorious "Musteites, social reformists, liberals, pacifists," etc., etc., as Roger Baldwin, J. M. Budish, Louis Boudin, Stuart Chase, Robert Dunn, Lewis S. Gannett, John Haynes Holmes, Timothy Healy, Darwin J. Messerole, Henry W. Pinkham, Anne Rochester, Gilbert E. Roe and a host of others.

What is this? Where is the "New Line"? Where is the "Third Period"? Where is the "Intensified Campaign to Expose the Fake Progressives and Liberals"? Where is "Class Against Class"? Where is the "United Front from Below"? We want enlightment!

Plenum Coming

It is authentically reported to us by Party comrades that the Party Secretariat (i. e., the Comintern Commission) has decided to call a Plenary session of the Central Executive Committee right after the Cleveland conference of the T.U.E.L. Now that the bureaucrats have expelled every supporter of the Communist Opposition in the Party they could lay hands on, and, more recently, since they have expelled the main leaders of the Right wing and frightened the others into temporary submission, they feel themselves quite safe in letting the rest of the C.E.C. come together to raise their hands for any policy or line or deed of the new leadership, past, present and future.

Bulletin of the Opposition

(BOLSHEVIK-LENINISTS)

In Russian

SOLD IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA AT

Two Dollars per Year.

Twenty-five Cents per Copy.

Eighteen Cents in Bundles.

AGENTS WANTED

Send All Orders to

THE MILITANT—Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York City.

The First Issue Contains:

Letters from Moscow on how the Political Bureau handled the deportation of Trotsky. The work of the Russian Opposition and the persecutions. Behind the scenes in the Party Political Bureau.

Articles by L. D. Trotsky on the Problems of the International Opposition. On Diplomacy or Revolutionary Policy. Interview with a Japanese Correspondent, and others.

The theses of the Chinese Bolshevik Opposition. And many others.

Forty Pages

The Cult of the 'Third Period'

By Maurice Spector

The "cloud by day and pillar of fire by night" that the Stalin E. C. C. I. conjures up to shield its disastrous ultra-left zig-zag, is the so-called "Third Period" invented in the theses of the Comintern Congress last July. Now in every "Daily Worker" contribution to the fraudulent "enlightenment campaign" this "third period" is invoked with deadly monotony as the latest all-sufficient, all-hallowing fetish before which the credulous party member must make the sign of the cross.

Insight into the motives for the invention of the "Third Period" may be gained from the study of a not dissimilar manoeuvre executed by the Zinoviev-Stalin leadership at the Fifth Congress (1924) at the beginning of the present crisis in the Soviet Union and the International. The German revolutionary situation of 1923 precipitated by the occupation of the Ruhr and economic collapse, the most favorable opportunity for the workers' conquest of political power since the Russian, was lost not only by the impotent Brandler-Thalheimer strategy but the no less feeble direction of the E. C. C. I. Zinoviev repeated the laisser-faire policy that disgraced him in the crucial test of 1917. The sagacious Stalin advocated allowing the Fascisti to get power first! Following the debacle, the bureaucratic Zinoviev-Stalin bloc dominating the E. C. C. I. had to salvage their papal infallibility in the Comintern at all costs, particularly as they were entrenching themselves for the thermidorian falsification of the legacy of Lenin under the guise of a crusade against "trotskyism". The slogan that was invented for this purpose was "Bolshevization", ostensibly aimed at social-democratic traditions in the communist parties.

THE FIFTH CONGRESS

The Fifth Congress was accordingly fixed up to look very "left" The E .C. C. I. proceeded to throw the blame for all that had gone wrong on the German leadership, on the objective situation, on the Russian Opposition, on the form of party organization, on everybody and anything but itself. The ultra-lefts whom Zinoviev had long patronized in reserve displaced the Brandlers and Thalheimers. "Give us fifty such as Maslow" said Stalin in a session of the International Control Commission, "and we will have no more anxiety on the score of the German Revolution". The chameleon Varga, taking on protective coloration, helped Zinoviev to furnish the Congress with a suitably misleading estimate of the world situation. The significance of American intervention for the stabilization of Europe, for the revival of social-democracy, and as a source of future revolutionary upheavals, was completely missed. Armed insurrection was retained on the agenda as an immediate prospect and the putsch in Esthonia was a subsequent by-product.

But the "left course" did not endure very long. Like a bolt from the blue to the Congress itself, came the announcement that the Russian unions were negotiating a bloc with the British General Council for international trade union unity and resistance to the war danger. This orientation on unity with the Amsterdam bureaucracy was the entering wedge of the series of opportunist acts which was the yielding of the Right-Center bloc in the Russian party to the increasing pressure of outside capitalist stabilization and the internal pressure of the kulak, nepman and bureaucrat. At a time when the stabilization was again showing its weaknesses in Great Britain, when the revolution was developing in China, and a new stage of struggle between capitalist and socialist elements was opening in the Soviet Union, Stalin promulgated the slogan "Fire to the Left", formulated the theory of "socialism in one country" with its implication of capitalist stabilization for decades, and came into sharp conflict with the Leningrad Opposition headed by the left centrist Zinoviev at the Fourteenth Party Congress (1925). The swing to the right of the Marxist line in the Russian party was thereupon automatically effected in the whole International. By means of such dishonest expedients as the Open Letter to the German Party, the Fisher-Maslow leadership was eliminated to cut the Leningrad Opposition off from a base in Western Europe, and the E. C. C. I. so unanimously elected at the Fifth Congress was bureaucratically re-constructed in the image of Stalin at successive plenums without mandate from any Congress and in violation of the statutes.

JUGGLING WITH "PERIODS"

Four years elapsed between the Fifth and Sixth Congresses, during which time the re-vamped E. C. C. I. was the obedient instrument and rubber-stamp of the ruling Right-Center (Rykov-Bucharin-Stalin) bloc. We have seen how the analysis of the international situation was made at the Fifth Congress to suit factional ends. This procedure was repeated at the Sixth Congress four years later, when Bucharin and Stalin did their juggling with the "periods". The official "Communist International" (Vol. VI. No 9-10) recently smuggled in an editorial admission that "in 1926-7... on the basis of the partial stabilization of capitalism, a revolutionary crisis developed in the far West and East". This is what the Communist Opposition, of course, said in those years when it was most important to say it. But for transparent reasons the theses of the Sixth Congress (1928) define the interval between the Fifth and Sixth Congresses, inclusive of 1926-7, the "second period of the post-war capitalism", in a way to suggest that it was not a period of revolutionary possibilities. In the re-capitulation of the attributes of this "second period", its architects conveniently "forget" to mention the facts of the Chinese Revolution, the British General Strike and the Viennese uprising. It is merely spoken of as a period of "relative stabilization, defensive struggles of the workers, successful socialist ocnstruction in the U. S. S. R. growing political influence of the Communist Parties, and inner consolidation of the Comintern." Nine-tenths of this characterization is falsehood and the remaining tenth needs qualification.

The method of optimistic lying to maintain the prestige of the leadership and keep up the "morale" of the home populace is not Marxist but was habitually resorted to by the general staffs in their communiques during the late world war. The history of the "second period" was falsified to stifle discussion and prevent the heavy accounting that otherwise Stalin and Bucharin would have had to render. They would have had to explain why they failed to give the correct bolshevik leadership that would have utilized the revolutionary possibilities of this period to develop offensives for the overthrow of the stabilization. They would have had to admit that they displayed no revolutionary initiative but pursued such right wing and centrist policies that objectively helped to strengthen capitalism, that they staked nearly all on the Kuomintang bourgeoisie, undermined the independence of the Chinese Communist Party, and opposed the propagation of the Soviets. They would have been found guilty of transforming the British Communist Party and the Minority movement into adjuncts of the British General Council, incapable of offering any substantial resistance to the betrayal of the General Strike. Under the shadow of their regime, the Viennese uprising found the Communist Party helpless and bewildered, the Sacco-Vanzetti demonstrations developed really outside the orbit of the Comintern influence, the French Party after heroic proclamations against the American Legion, turned tail and retired for polite demonstration to a Parisian suburb and the Red Day organized by the Czech Party against Fascism was turned into a farce by the passivity of the leadership.

The extension of the political influence of the Communist parties and their inner consolidation during this period are equally myths. The machine man Piatnitski's brochure "Organization of the World Party" establishes for the critical reader that the membership of nearly every communist party declined, as did their trade union influence, press circulation and political activity of the nuclei. The membership of the American Party, it may be recalled, fell from 16,325 in 1925 to 7,277 in 1928. The proceedings of the Sixth Congress will show that every "monolithic" party was rent by violent factional struggles that resulted in fresh splits in Czecho-Slovakia, the United States, Germany in addition to those which had already taken place in France, Holland, Belgium and the Soviet Union. The authors of the "second" and "third" periods equally misrepresent the real situation in the Soviet Union, where under their regime the growth of the restorationist elements culminated in a bloodless uprising of the Kulaks creating the grain crisis of 1927-8, and they omit to record the unparalleled development of bureaucracy in party and state apparatus.

CONCLUDED IN NEXT ISSUE

SLOGANS for GASTONIA

The New York district of the Young Communist League publishes a monthly District Bulletin for the membership. In the August 1929 issue we find the following: On page 2 is a big headline which reads: "SMASH the GASTONIA *FRAME-UP*". On Page 3, among the slogans advanced for International Youth Day, is included this one: "FIGHT THE GASTONIA *FRAME-UP!*" On page 9, at the conclusion of an official editorial entitled "Soviet Union Invaded", we find the slogan: "Fight the Gastonia *Frame-Up!*" On page 19, in an article entitled "Sacco-Vanzetti Memorial", we read: "This demonstration will be of utmost importance this year because of the attempts to repeat the Sacco-Vanzetti case by the legal murder of the Gastonia *framed-up* textile strikers". (All emphasis ours).

The Bulletin of the Y.C.L. grasps the central feature of the Gastonia case and raises the correct leading slogan of the campaign for defense, as pointed out before in the Militant. It is to be hoped that the Pary "elders" will learn elementary lessons like this from the Youth.

IN THE NEXT ISSUE

The next issue of the Militant will contain, among other material, the following: A complete review of the T. U. E. L. conference in Cleveland, and a report on the proceedings by one of the delegates; an article on the significance of L. Hendin's quitting the Communist Party; another article by comrade Trotsky on Brandler and Thalheimer; and many other articles of vital importance.

The Party's Election Program in New York

The New York district of the Communist Party is circulating a mimeographed "Platform of the Class Struggle" for the municipal and state election campaign in 1929, with the central slogan of "Class against Class"; that is, with the same slogan applied with such disastrous results in England, and in France for almost two years.

This is the charger that the Party's parliamentary generals Weinstone, Trachtenberg, et. al., have now changed to after having rode so bellicosely (it was not so many months ago) in the ranks of an unconditional united front with Jacob Pauken, Roewer of Boston and the Milwaukee socialists. We opposed the notorious Panken "maneuver" of Weinstone and company (*before* the Comintern decision as well as afterwards) and we oppose the slogan of "Class against Class" with the same vigor.

What is wrong with this slogan? Everything. It flies in the face of every principle of Marxism and Leninism, which teach us that there is no fixed relation and existence of only two organized, well-defined and homogeneous classes, that outside of the proletariat there is only one reactionary mass. It excludes the possibility for the workers to win allies among the urban petty bourgeoisie and the rural peasantry for the struggle against the big bourgeoisie. It contains precisely that error, raised to the n-th degree, of which the Stalinists have falsely accused Trotsky of entertaining with regard to the theory of permanent revolution. It is a hypnotic formula intended to cover up the failure to mobilize the workers on the basis of their immediate demands and needs, a substitute which cannot mobilize the masses because it is abstract, since it assumes that the workers (especially in the United States) have attained a high degree of class conconsciousness and differentiation, and class organization. The American workers, who have not yet even entered upon the path of independent political action, who do not yet even vote for the reformist socialists, will not and cannot be set into motion by this slogan. Even in a directly revolutionary situation, the slogan is worth nothing. The Bolsheviks in 1917 mobilized the workers for the revolution with the concrete, immediate, practical slogans of "Bread, Peace and Land" If all these political and theoretical considerations are not sufficient, then the experiences in France and England will more than supplement them.

One would think that with such a "very revolutionary" (in reality it is revisionist-sectarian) central slogan, the rest of the platform would be in the same tone. But that is not the case. The platform contains the incredible number of ninty-eight demands, by actual count. This is equivalent to raising no immediate demands. What is far worse is the thoroughly opportunist character of most of these demands. We would need a volume to analyze all of them; we will point out only a few of them here, demands not calculated to mobilize the workers for struggle against capitalism on the basis of their immediate demands, but calculated to instill reformist and pacifist illusions in the workers.

The Platform demands that "judges shall not be appointed. They shall be elected by the working people and should be removable at any time by the will of the majority of their electors". These are shadows from the graves of Allan Benson and Charles Edward Russell. Why not the general initiative, referendum and recall?

The Platform raises as its main demand in the transit muddle the five cent fare and free transfers! It staunchly calls for free milk for all pre-school children, and "free diet kitchens and food stations" for mothers. Why not municipal meat markets and crematories? They are also contained in the municipal campaign books of the old Socialist Party, edited then by the same Trachtenberg who so calmly appropriates them now for the Communist municipal platform. There is, by the way, a startling identity of the Party's demands in general with those of the old S. P. (See the 1920 Campaign book and the 1914 Congressional campaign book of the S. P.)

The sections on the Negro problem are indistinguishable from the standpoint of any advanced liberal or the N. A. A. C. P.—with the exception of the slogan of the right to self-determination. There is no attempt to indicate the class purpose behind segregation, discrimination, and other persecutions of the Negro, and no call for a united struggle of Negro and white workers. The same can be said with little change of the "housing demands". The main complaint of the Party on "mothers' pensions provided under the New York State law" is that they are "entirely inadequate" (!), i. e., an acceptance of the basic principle.

Only at the very end of the Platform is the "coming imperialist war" dealt with. The danger of war is not inextricably knitted with all the other problems. It is not connected with rationalization, with the persecution of and drive upon the workers, with the whole relation of forces and the struggle between the workers and the master class in the United States. No, it is still raised as some special, isolated question, for which special methods, a specific line of policy must be applied. There is not even a mention of the Kellogg Pact (has Weinstone, as well as Stalin and Rykov, signed it?); there is no mention of the heart of the war danger, i. e., the struggle between England and the U. S., but the *main* and *only* emphasis is put on the less likely danger of war between Russia and the U. S.

But the demands raised against the war danger are most outrageous. "Abolition of the present mercenery army and navy and state militia". A thoroughly pacifist and anti-Leninist slogan which disgraces a Communist document! "Immediate withdrawal from the world court." There is more petty-bourgeois and pacifist nonsense in the platform than we have space for.

The Platform is a bad one, a very bad one, it should be condemned and withdrawn. It is corrupted with petty-bourgeois and reformist poison. There is a burning need for a platform of class struggle directed against the twin Parties of the bourgeoisie and their socialist train-bearers.

PARTY PROGRESS

The 3rd Period Hits St. Louis

A clearcut illustration of "Third period" adventurism and the consequent isolation, is afforded in St. Louis. The May Day Conference called by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the Mooney-Billings Freedom Conference called by the Molders' Union were exceptional opportunities for mass activity and for the local Party to become a factor in the St. Louis labor movement. Did the Party get out Lenin's slogan of the united front and work in these conferences, pushing them so St. Louis would have a huge May Day Mass Meeting, and so that the workers and their organizations and unions would become aroused about the frame-up system and Mooney and Billings? No. Well, what did the Party do? Nothing. That is, nothing with reference to the Mooney-Billings Freedom Conference; the May Day Conference they broke up.

Let us take these up singly and see what we get out of this adventurism. The May Day Conference called by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers was an opportunity for St. Louis to hold a huge May Day Mass-Meeting on the basis of a united front with other labor organizations. The delegates to the Conference had no disagreement about the program or policy for the proposed May Day meeting (briefly, Fight against imperialist war! Defend Workers' Soviet Russia! Fight against low wages, long hours, rationalization, etc.) yet the Party leadership, who controlled the majority of delegates, broke up the conference! They were against a united front on any basis; their advice was each labor organization shall hold their own May Day meeting! The result was no joint May Day Mass-Meeting; three small, isolated meetings being held instead, with only the Communist League of America (Opposition) holding a meeting which could at all be called successful. A chance to politically wake-up St. Louis with a huge joint mass-meeting and the Party's slogan is "Break up the Conference!"

The other illustration of a bankrupt leadership is afforded in the Mooney-Billings Freedom Conference called by Local 59, of the International Molder's Union. Some twenty local unions and several labor organizations have participated in the work but at none of the conferences has the Party done anything. Why, the Party has not even been represented! Neither has the I.L.D., the W.I.R., the Y.C.L., or any of the Party controlled organizations, Ladies Auxiliary, etc. Why was this?

Here was an opportunity for the Party to be freed from their Labor Lyceum isolation; to push if not lead a union fight against the frame-up system, yet the Party's policy is "we don't want to have anything to do with them, they're labor fakers". To hell with the united front, to hell with the fight against the frame-up system, to hell with a demonstration and mass-meeting for Mooney and Billings, "we won't have anything to do with the A.F.L., they're labor fakers"!

The result is the Mooney-Billings public protest meeting and the automobile parade on July 27th, 13th anniversary of Mooney and Billings' imprisonment is being held without the local Party and their controlled organizations taking any part in the demonstration. A new force is in the field: the Communist League of America (Opposition) and they are the pushing and leading force. Accordingly we find the "Boycotting" Party becoming more and more isolated and foreign to the St. Louis labor movement; each adventure isolates it more—while the Communist Opposition finds its influence growing, its ranks larger, because it is a part of the labor movement, and its political line is for the workingclass.

And so the local Party remains, as it has been for some time, isolated. A clique of Labor Lyceum debators. With the Jimmy Higginess one by one becoming demoralized and disgusted, some with the isolation from the labor movement, others with the overnight expulsions of yesterday's "Leading and outstanding, best comrades". Most of the local members are Party patriots with little or no understanding of the Comintern policies and of Bucharin, Stalin and Trotsky; suddenly confronted by a C.E.C. member with: "unanimously and unreservedly endorse" this latest action or you are fighting against the Comintern, and are a socialist, menshevik, degenerate, counter-revolutionist, and they unanimously endorse anything and everything, not in the least enlightened but hoping that the C.E.C. member is right—that *now* everything is all right.

But it is hopeless to hope for heaven—for a mass Communist movement when the leadership continues their adventuristic policies of isolating and splitting the Party. The rank and file should fight for an internal bolshevik discussion of the three political lines before the Party; the opportunist (Bucharin) the adventurist (Stalin) and the Leninist (Trotsky). An open discussion on the fictitious issue of "Trotskyism" will give a complete understanding of the present situation in the Comintern. To this end all rank and file members will come; there is no other remedy or solution. Mass Communist Parties do not grow on trees or out of unanimous endorsements; they are based on understanding, and on correct workingclass policy.

MARTIN C. PAYER.

TWO LETTERS FROM AFAR

A LETTER FROM ALFRED ROSMER

Prinkipo, Turkey, July 9, 1929.

Dear Comrade Cannon:

We have decided here to publish an International Review, called "Opposition" as soon as possible. We hope to be ready by next September. This review is to be published in two languages: French and German. An English edition is, of course, very desirable, but we believe it not possible for the present . . . In the meantime, we shall send you, of course, all articles of an international interest for insertion in The Militant...

We hope that the French Opposition will take during the months to come a new development. We are preparing a weekly which, according to our intention, must unite the present small groups—or most of the comrades who are in them—and above all many Communists who are no more members of the Party but are quite demoralized by Stalin's zigzags and partially inactive, our task will be hard but we take it with great confidence.

The arrival every fortnight of The Militant is always a great joy to me. I read it at once from beginning to end: it is good stuff and I admire your fighting spirit in the struggle against the Stalinist clique.

With my best wishes for the young Communist League,

Fraternally yours,

A. ROSMER.

P. S.—You know perhaps that Foster is an old acquaintance of mine. I wonder how he can stay in Stalin's galley. I used to hear him speak rather harshly of "bolshevisation."

FROM THE CHINESE OPPOSITION

Shanghai, China, July 8, 1929.

Dear Comrade:

Your periodical received with many thanks. In the fighting against the opportunistic leadership of the Party, we are reinforced by international theoretical support. As the Stalinist regime has reigned over all the world, we are sure that the fight against opportunism will be our united task.

We, under the Stalinist suppression, are hardly able to receive any information about the truth of Russia. Yet we have passed already one year since our organization has been founded. Victory is already on our side, in that the mass of the party has followed us on all the fronts that we face.

Our Party leadership is the true and honest disciple of opportunism. They follow what Stalin does against us. But we will never be discouraged, although we are under extreme suppression of our party leaders. They forbid us to criticize the opportunistic policy taken in Russia as well as on an international scale. Under this condition we could not help but publish our paper and distribute to all the members of the Party. We feel that we have not yet got the sympathy of the masses outside of the Pary. We hope that hereafter our attention will be given to this kind of work, as you did. We try to publish our periodical named THE PROLETARIAN. It shall appear before you very soon.

The Chinese revolution has lost all that we have been fighting for. Opportunistic leadership betrayed our hoped-for victory. We are now facing various kinds of oppression. We are in need of economic resources.

We hope that you will send us books and papers relative to recent conditions of the International Opposition. Organizationally, we have Action Committees in the nuclei in every part of China.

We hope you will inform us as to the condition actually in Soviet Russia and the Third International.

In your paper we hope you can put more material on the position in China.

With Communist Greetings,

ACTION COMMITTEE OF THE CHINESE OPPOSITION.

By P.

The Sacco-Vanzetti Meetings

Outstanding in the second anniversary of the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti was the failure of the revolutionary elements to mobilize the workers for an international memorial demonstration, and to utilize the movement generated thereby for an intensified struggle against the persecution and imprisonment of working class fighters. The Comintern did not even make an effort to organize demonstrations internationally. In Europe, there were no demonstrations, at least none was reported either in the bourgeois or the Communist press. In the United States, there was no national movement organized, despite the pressing need and the excellent opportunity to knit the lessons of the Sacco-Vanzetti case with the struggle for the Gastonia defendants. The New York "demonstration" in Union Square was a pitiful fiasco—only some 3000 attended the meeting organized by the Party. In most of the other centers there was not even an endeavor to demonstrate on the anniversary. It was simply passed over.

This is a warning signal for the Party of the passivity that has crept into the ranks. The huge movement for Sacco and Vanzetti must and can be revived for Gastonia and for the workers who are already imprisoned, some of them for years. The present Party policy, however, is powerless to accomplish this urgent task.

COMMUNIST LEAGUE ACTIVITIES

The Communist League of America and its branches are undertaking numerous activities. Some of the work is cited below:

NEW YORK CITY: The New York branch of the Communist League is conducting very successful street meetings every Saturday night. Militants and the pamphlet, the Criticism of the Draft Program of the Comintern by L. D. Trostky, have been sold in large numbers at each meeting. Among the speakers have been comrades Max Shachtman, Martin Abern, Maurice Spector, S. M. Rose and many other members of the branch.

The branch is also conducting a membership drive and eight new applicants were accepted at the last two branch meetings which are held weekly. Sale of the Militant is stressed and upwards of one thousand copies of the August 15th issue are expected to be sold. The newsstands selling the Militant are regularly increasing.

A study class is also being formed for the fall and winter months.

A program of trade union and labor organization activities is being mapped out by the local Executive Committee. The branch is made up largely of members active in the labor unions.

CHICAGO, ILL. The Chicago branch is one of the best branches in support of the Militant and is now conducting a campaign to raise its quota for the projected WEEKLY MILITANT. Some of the oldest and livest wires in the revolutionary movement are in the Chicago branch. The Chicago comrades have been particularly awake to the task of getting subscribers to the Militant and the Chicago list grows rapidly.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN. This branch of the Communist League is the unquestioned backbone of the revolutionary labor and Communist movement in Minneapolis. Its members are experienced workers in the labor unions and other labor organizations. Some of its activities are reported on in other columns of The Militant, notably its work in aiding to organize the unorganized clothing workers under the leadership of Oliver Carlson, an alternate member of the National Committee of the Communist League. Such live elements as Vincent R. Dunne, Carl Skoglund, O. R. Votaw, C. R. Hedlund, L. Roseland, Oscar Sover, Carl Cowl, and many others give the Communist League a prestige throughout the ranks of the workers.

The Minneapolis League is pushing the drive for the defense of the Gastonia frame-up victims, and is endeavoring to organize the movement on the widest possible united front basis.

The Minneapolis branch is strongly behind the drive of the National Committee for a Weekly Militant, as well as in maintaining the paper from issue to issue. The branch undertook a house to house canvass for the Militant with considerable success, and the idea is recommended to other branches. The Minneapolis group rivals Chicago as subscription getters for the Militant. The comrades report also that the St. Paul branch is getting under way.

ST. LOUIS, MO. Since the formation of the St. Louis branch of the Communist League, St. Louis has been seen more Communist activity than it has for a long time. The branch is especially active in the Mooney-Billings campaign and is working to broaden this and similar movements to draw in every possible labor organization into the campaign.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA. Comrade Sarah Linn in this bailiwick of the Southern steel and cotton lords distributes The Militant and does all possible to further our revolutionary work.

RICHMOND, CALIF. A branch of the Communist League is being formed here.

BOSTON, MASS. An enthusiastic meeting of the Boston branch greeted the distribution by comrade L. Schlosberg of membership cards and dues stamps of the Communist League. Subscriptions for the Militant are coming in steadily from the Massachusetts territory. Our comrades in Boston have been very active in the shoe workers' strike. The Militant has a very good sale throughout Boston, Roxbury and nearby points.

KASAS CITY, MO. "Shorty" Buehler, secretary of the Kansas City branch, reports that the Communist League there recently held a successful picnic for the benefit of the Militant, and that the comrades are now concentrating on new members. The Militant has sold well indeed, and a deep ferment has been aroused among the Communists and sympathizers in Kansas City, and all to the good of the Opposition led by comrade Trotsky.

WILLISTON, N. D. Comrade A. C. Miller, the first Communist legislator in the United States, reports that a strong branch of the Communist League is being formed of workers and poor farmers in and around Williston who are disgusted with the opportunistic policy of the Stalin clique and its local agent, Knunson.

Space prevents further reports of branch activities in the United States and Canada, but a regular feature will be made of organization activities from now on. Comrades are requested to send in brief reports regularly for publication.

The National Committee of the League is conducting a drive for the Weekly Militant. See other columns.